REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-17. An Amendment After Final was filed on May 21, 2008. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action dated June 2, 2008 indicating that the May 21, 2008 Amendment will be entered.

Further to the amendments made in the Amendment After Final filed on May 21, 2008, claims 1, 6 and 11-15 are amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found at least on page 8, lines 10-14 [42] of the Specification as filed.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the Amendment of May 21, 2008 and this Amendment.

A Request for Continued Examination is submitted.

No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-17 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

**** **** ****

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

The claimed invention includes outputting "a request signal suggesting the user should input information on the problem occurring during the search processing as know-how message when determining that the problem has occurred", which is not disclosed or suggested by Stier, Britt, and Schmidt.

Due to the above-mentioned configuration "a user is prompted to register precautions, know-how for interpreting data, and the like to be output in accordance with an input situation of search conditions in user's search processing ([0014])". Therefore, the effect that the user can register know-how without fail can be obtained.

In contrast, col. 8, lines 57-63 of Stier states, "When the agent 13 recognizes that her query represents missing, incorrect, or incomplete knowledge in the knowledge base, before saving the interaction, she may create a memo outlining the problem with the knowledge base and suggesting the knowledge that should be added to the knowledge base." That is, Stier explicitly states that the agent 13 may create a memo outlining the problem with the knowledge base and that the agent 13 may create a memo suggesting the knowledge that should be added to the knowledge base.

However, Stier does not teach or suggest how to cause agent 13 to recognize the problem with the knowledge base or the knowledge that should be added to the knowledge base. In other words, Stier does not teach or suggest a system and method for initiating the agent's recognition of a problem. Stier does not teach or suggest a technique for supporting the agent 13 in recognizing "her query represents missing, incorrect, or incomplete knowledge in the knowledge base."

On page 2 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner asserts that the "How do I" tab in Stier describes "know-how" message on "a problem", as taught by the claimed invention. However, Stier does not teach or suggest that the system "determines that a problem occurs" and "outputs a request signal suggesting the user should input information" (prompts the user), as taught by the claimed invention.

The invention of claims 1, 6 and 11-15 of the present application includes letting the user recognize that the problem has occurred i.e., "a unit which outputs a request signal suggesting the user should input information on the problem occurring during the search processing as know-how message when determining that the problem has occurred."

Britt and Schmidt, alone or in combination, teach or suggest enabling "the user can register know-how without fail" by outputting a request signal suggesting the user should input know-how information at the occurrence of a problem.

At least on page 2 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner Birkhoelzer teaches "know-how message [which] is voice data storing uttered contents of the user", as recited in claims 4 and 9, since the user in Birkhoelzer can prescribe voice data. However, Birkhoelzer only describes transmission of encrypted voice data and generating a text data file from the voice data. There is no mention of prompting a user to input "know-how message [which] is voice data" during "search processing", as taught by the claimed invention. In other words, an attempt to bring in the isolated teachings of the references would amount to improperly picking and choosing features from different references without regard to the teachings of the references as a whole. While the required evidence of motivation to combine need not come from the applied references themselves, the evidence must come from *somewhere* within the record.

While Applicants are aware that the claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation, MPEP § 2111 requires that the claims be interpreted "in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art."

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 20, 2008   By: _____
                                       Temnit Afework
                                       Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

9